

position of leadership on either side of the aisle to address this issue in a meaningful way. We have changed the parties in charge, but we haven't changed the practice.

So the mantle falls on the institutionalists among us to foster this change, those who deep down know that we owe more to this institution than we are giving it.

It is time to stand up and be counted.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

POLITICAL PRISONERS FOR ONE YEAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, today it is cold in Washington. It is snowing. They say it may snow some more. But there are two places in the United States that are colder than in this city, and they are in separate places. They are two prison cells, Federal penitentiaries, where two border agents, now, today have spent one calendar year in confinement for doing their job on the Texas-Mexico border.

Madam Speaker, it seems as though border agents Ramos and Compean have been punished for doing what we hired them to do. Because, you see, when they were patrolling the Texas-Mexico border, a drug smuggler came into the United States bringing almost a million dollars worth of drugs into this country. They had a confrontation with this drug dealer. They both believed him to have a weapon. Shots were fired, and he disappeared in Mexico, leaving his load of drugs in this country.

Unbeknownst to them, they shot the drug smuggler. A few months later, our Federal Government relentlessly went and found this drug dealer, brought him back to the United States and gave him immunity from his crimes to testify against the border agents for, get this, a civil rights violation against him, the drug smuggler. They were tried and they were convicted and sent to the Federal penitentiary for 11 and 12 years.

But what the jury in that trial did not know was that the U.S. Justice Department, the Attorney General's Office, hid evidence in that case from the jury, because Madam Speaker, they not only made a deal with this drug smuggler not to prosecute him for bringing in a million dollars worth of drugs; while he is waiting to testify at the trial, he brings in another load of drugs. And then our U.S. Attorney's Office had the audacity for months to deny that ever occurred.

But now the truth has come out. Now we know. Now the whole world knows that that evidence was hidden from the jury. The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals has heard this case on appeal. We are waiting to see if they reverse the case because the U.S. Attorney's Office hid evidence that the jury should have heard because, you see, the star witness, the witness that the U.S. Attorney's Office made a backroom deal with, brought in other drugs. The jury should have known that to judge the credibility of the witness. And this is not the first time the U.S. Attorney's Office has done this.

In the year 2000, another border agent by the name of David Sipes came in contact with a human smuggler. He had a fight with him in the Rio Grande River as the human smuggler was bringing in people. And then David Sipes was prosecuted for, yes, a civil rights violation for assaulting the human smuggler.

In that particular case, the U.S. Attorney's Office did the same thing. They hid evidence from the jury. They hid from the jury that this human smuggler was given \$80,000 as a settlement, that he was allowed to cross back and forth between the United States and Mexico, that he was given a Texas driver's license, a U.S. Social Security card. And also in that case, yes, that human smuggler, while waiting to testify, brought in another load of illegals into this country.

But in that case, the U.S. Attorney's Office was caught. A new trial was ordered because they hid evidence, and that jury in that case found David Sipes, border agent, not guilty because the U.S. Attorney's Office was not seeking justice but convictions.

It makes us wonder what our U.S. Attorney's Office is doing and what side of they border war they are on. They are supposed to be protecting Americans. They are supposed to be protecting the border agents. But yet they seem to prefer protecting human smugglers and drug dealers. That makes us wonder whether the Justice Department needs to be investigated as to their priorities, because this ought not to be.

Yet two border agents are still in prison 1 year today. They have served time, and they should be released. The President should pardon them, and hopefully the Fifth Circuit will do the right thing and order a new trial in this case.

Our government needs to be on the right side of the border war and support our border agents and make people understand that you can't bring drugs and illegals into the country without being prosecuted.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING THE LIFE OF HRANT DINK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to solemnly remember the life of journalist and activist Hrant Dink.

On January 19, 2007, Mr. Dink was gunned down by a Turkish ultranationalist outside his newspaper office in Istanbul, Turkey.

Hrant Dink was a man who called for tolerance, peaceful dialogue, and greater civil rights for all Turkish citizens. He was a fierce defender of freedom and believed all people have equal rights under the law. He believed that everyone should have the right to know the truth about their Nation's past, however dark that past may be.

Hrant Dink had been prosecuted by the Turkish Government under penal code 301, a law that bans free speech and was used to suppress a wide range of dissenting opinion, from criticism of Turkish Government institutions to opposing official Turkish denial of the Ottoman campaign of genocide against its Armenian population. Under the all-encompassing phrase "insulting Turkishness," a citizen in Turkey can receive a prison sentence of up to 3 years with the offense being increased by 50 percent if the so-called offense is committed abroad.

Nearly 100 journalists and intellectuals have been prosecuted under article 301, including Nobel Prize author Orhan Pamuk. Many informed observers believe Hrant Dink's prosecution under article 301 opened him up to a campaign of harassment and death threats from ultranationalists, which eventually led to his murder. To this day, citizens of Turkey live under threat of this gag law, with Hrant Dink's own son prosecuted under this law because he reprinted his father's newspaper articles.

This is not the action of a true democracy. It is reflective of how a totalitarian state would behave, and this is not the Turkey we, the United States of America, have aligned our country with.

Amnesty International has called for a complete repeal of this punitive legislation. The European Commission has repeatedly asked for its repeal.

Unfortunately, indications now suggest that the Government of Turkey is only tinkering with changes, making this gag rule even more ambiguous. Today, I ask the House to support calls for the Turkish Government to immediately repeal article 301.

One year ago, Members of Congress, their staffers and several members, and members of several communities, came together to watch "Screamers," a film about genocide in the last century, featuring, among others, Hrant Dink. Here, in the Halls of Congress, we watched as Hrant Dink discussed the problems of article 301.

Just 2 days after the film's premiere, Hrant Dink was shot dead, a man who only wanted to speak the truth about historical facts as he saw them, a man who wanted every citizen to be treated equally, a man we should applaud here